



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_30476
Title of the Manuscript:	METHOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES OF FORMATION OF TARIFFS FOR RAILWAY
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The title of the article: is it about 'METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES...'? Presently, it reads as 'METHOLOGOLOGICAL.....'. 2. First and above all: the paper has to be substantially revised with regard to the English translation. A special attention should be given to (follow example line numbers): (a) confusing or elliptical formulations (lack of the verbs) and punctuation (Lines #45, #55); (b) oral styles sentences (Lines #62, #232) 3. Due to the above fact, the understanding or the interpretation or the problematics dealt with in the paper could be subject to some degree of incertitude or relativity from the part of the reader. 4. This paper's main goal (as defined in line #36 to #43) is to analyze the prices and rates policies, the legal framework and the related tools, with applications to the field of railway transport in Ukraine. 5. The interest of this analysis resides in that the subject field is hybrid with regard to the prices and the rates policies. Specifically, this comprises a natural monopoly component and a potential competitive component, whose prices and rates policies and objectives are conflicting.	1) Thank you for your advice, it was the carelessness of authors 2) Thank you for your advice, the authors change some words 3) Thank you for your advice, the authors believe that the article is understandable to all readers 4) Thank you for your advice, this article is a continuation of the study of the regulation of railway transport of Ukraine 5) Regulation of railway transport in Ukraine should be carried out with the help of the state, and with the help of the levers of the market because railway terms, the infrastructure is a natural monopoly (government regulation), and passengers/freight transportation it is necessary to develop competition with other transport 6) Yes. administrative method, that is, the state's participation in the regulation of railway infrastructure (natural monopoly component) and economic method for regulation potentially competitive sector 7) Thank you for you recommendation



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. The regulatory process is examined as part of the overall process of the pricing at the government level. This process is described and analyzed in separate sections, from two perspectives: administrative methods and economic methods. 7. The paper also includes synoptic of the pricing regulatory tools used by the government in Ukraine, with short and useful remarks. We consider this to be undoubtedly useful for other interested people working in the field. 8. To better highlight, we suggest the <i>impact</i> of the issues dealt with (solutions of principle and associated tools), to be marked as a separate section – the text starting from Line #190. 9. About references: these must be aligned (both the list and the citing style) to the explanation http://www.sciencedomain.org/page/general:guideline-for-others.	8) Thank you for your positive recommendations
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The paper approach is that of a short “<i>research results overview report</i>”. The discussion of the theoretical and applicative results is sufficiently detailed to facilitate the reader’s personal interpretation and inspired new investigation. NO other revision needed.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. It could be of further interest, and this is up to the author, the article to be continued by a short “<i>research application result report</i>”, illustrating and discussing the applicative results (evolutions/effects, trends; aggregated/detailed; comparative, time variation or other). Alternatively, a short, dedicated section could be added to the present article content.	